

# BACONIANA.

VOL. XV. *Third Series.*

JULY, 1917.

No. 59.

## THE FIRST "LIFE OF BACON."

IT is a strange fact in connection with the great Francis Bacon, to preserve whose memory our Society is founded, that the first account of his life that appeared, only five years after he had retired from this world's stage, has been quite overlooked and neglected by English writers upon him. This first Life came out in the French "*Histoire Naturelle*," published in Paris in 1631. It gives much information about him that Rawley did not disclose in his "Life," prefixed to the "*Resuscitatio*," published in 1657, the first English life to appear, and which was so long—31 years—in coming out after the close of Bacon's career. Rawley did not show much anxiety to give the public what he knew and felt about his great Master, when he was so leisurely about the production of his "Life." The Frenchman—Pierre Amboise, if it were he who wrote in 1631—was more active in the matter, and gives us an insight into the mind and thoughts of the man of whom he writes in a manner that is notably intimate and yet restrained. He tells us also that he travelled during some years of his youth in France, Italy and Spain, a fact that we Baconians have surmised for ourselves from the study of books that we feel sure were written by him, though it is a fact that Rawley did not give us in his Life. Rawley himself does not allude to this "Life," neither does Mallet, nor Montague, nor Spedding, nor James Robertson, nor G. Walter Steeves, to come down to the latest writers on Bacon ; though it

was quoted, with approval, as a "just and elegant discourse," by Gilbert Wats, in his forewords to the translation of Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," published in 1640. The first time that this French Life appeared in English was in 1911, when Mr. Cuninghame gave a translation of it in his book, "Bacon's Secret Disclosed," actually 280 years after its first appearance in Paris.

We have thought it right that this first "Life" should have a place in the pages of BACONIANA, there to be on record for the study and reference of our members.—ED., BACONIANA.

"DISCOURSE ON THE LIFE OF M. FRANCIS BACON  
CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND.

"Those who have known the quality of M. Bacon's mind from reading his works, will—in my opinion—be desirous to learn who he was, and to know that Fortune did not forget to recompense merit so rare and extraordinary as was his. It is true, however, that she was less gracious to his latter age than to his youth; for his life had such happy beginning, and an end so rough and strange, that one is astonished to see England's principal Minister of State, a man great both in birth and in possessions, reduced actually to the verge of lacking the necessaries of life.

"I have difficulty in coinciding with the opinion of the common people, who think that great men are unable to beget children similar to themselves, as though nature was in that particular inferior to the art which can easily produce portraits that are likenesses: especially as history teaches us that the greatest personages have often found in their own families heirs of their virtues as well as of their possessions. And indeed, without the need of going to search for far away examples, we see that M. Bacon was the son of a father



who possessed no less virtue than he : his worth secured to him the honour of being so well-beloved by Queen Elizabeth that she gave him the position of Keeper of the Seals, and placed in his hands the most important affairs of her Kingdom. And in truth it pains me to say that soon after his promotion to the first-named dignity, he was the principal instrument that she made use of in order to establish the Protestant Religion in England.

" Although that work was so odious in its nature, yet if one considers it according to political maxims, we can easily see that it was one of the greatest and boldest undertakings that had been carried out for many centuries : and one ought not the less to admire the Author of it, in that he had known how to conduct a bad business so dexterously, as to change both the form of Religion, and the belief, of an entire Country, without having disturbed its tranquility. M. Bacon was not only obliged to imitate the virtues of such an one, but also those of many others of his ancestors, who have left so many marks of their greatness in history that honour and dignity seem to have been at all times the spoil of his family. Certain it is that no one can reproach him with having added less than they to the splendour of his race. Being thus born in the purple [*ne parmy les pourpres*] and brought up with the expectation of a great career [*l'esperance d'une grande fortune*], his father had him instructed in ' *bonnes lettres* ' with such great and such especial care, that I know not to whom we are the more indebted for all the splendid works [*les beaux ouvrages*] that he has left to us : whether to the mind of the son, or to the care the father had taken in making him cultivate it. But, however that may be, the obligation we are under to the father is not small. Capacity [*jugement*] and memory were never in any man to such

a degree as in this one : so that in a very short time he made himself conversant with all the knowledge he could acquire at College. And though he was then considered capable of undertaking the most important affairs [*capable des charges les plus importants*] yet, so that he should not fall into the usual fault of young men of his kind (who by a too hasty ambition often bring to the management of great affairs, a mind still full of the crudities of the school), M. Bacon himself wished to acquire that knowledge which in former times made Ulysses so commendable, and earned for him the name of Wise ; by the study of the manners of many different nations. I wish to state that he employed some years of his youth in travel, in order to polish his mind and to mould his opinion by intercourse with all kinds of foreigners. France, Italy and Spain, as the most civilised nations of the whole world, were those whither his desire for knowledge [*curiosité*] carried him. And as he saw himself destined one day to hold in his hands the helm of the Kingdom [*le timon du Royaume*] instead of looking only at the people and the different fashions in dress, as do the most of those who travel, he observed judiciously the laws and the customs of the countries through which he passed, noted the different forms of Government in a State, with their advantages or defects, together with all the other matters which might help to make a man able for the government of men.

" Having by these means reached the summit of learning and virtue, it was fitting that he should also reach that of dignity. For this reason, some time after his return, the King, who well knew his worth, gave him several small matters to carry out, that might serve for him as stepping-stones to high positions : in these he acquitted himself so well that he was in due course considered worthy of the same



position that his father vacated with his life. And in carrying out the work of Chancellor he gave so many proofs of the largeness of his mind, that one can say without flattery that England owes to his wise counsels, and his good rule, a part of the repose she has so long enjoyed. And King James, who then reigned, should not take to himself alone all the glory of this, for it is certain that M<sup>r</sup> Bacon should share it with him. We may truly say that this Monarch was one of the greatest Princes of his time, who understood thoroughly well the worth and value of men, and he made use to the fullest extent of M. Bacon's services, and relied upon his vigilance to support the greater part of the burden of the Crown. The Chancellor never proposed anything for the good of the State, or the maintenance of justice, but was carried out by the Royal power ; and the authority of the Master seconded the good intentions of the servant ; so that one must avouch that this Prince was worthy to have such a Minister, and he worthy of so great a King.

" Among so many virtues that made this great man commendable Prudence, as the first of all the Moral virtues, and that most necessary to those of his profession, was that which shone in him the most brightly. His profound wisdom can be most readily seen in his books, and his matchless fidelity in the signal services that he continuously rendered to his Prince. Never was there man who so loved equity, or so enthusiastically worked for the public good as he : so that I may aver that he would have been much better suited to a Republic than to a Monarchy, where frequently the convenience of the Prince is more thought of, than that of his people. And I do not doubt that, had he lived in a Republic, he would have acquired as much glory from the citizens, as formerly did Aristides and Cato, the one in Athens, the other

in Rome. Innocence oppressed found always in his protection a sure refuge, and the position of the great gave them no vantage ground before the Chancellor, when suing for justice.

"Vanity, avarice, and ambition, vices that too often attach themselves to great honours, were to him quite unknown, and if he did a good action, it was not from the desire of fame, but simply because he could not do otherwise. His good qualities were entirely pure, without being clouded by the admixture of any imperfections; and the passions that form usually the defects in great men, in him only served to bring out his virtues; if he felt hatred and rage it was only against evil doers, to show his detestation of their crimes; and success or failure in the affairs of his country, brought to him the greater part of his joys or his sorrows. He was as truly a good man, as he was an upright judge, and by the example of his life, corrected vice and bad living, as much as by pains and penalties. And in a word, it seemed that Nature had exempted from the ordinary frailties of men him whom she had marked out to deal with their crimes. All these good qualities made him the darling of the people, and prized by the great ones of the State. But when it seemed that nothing could destroy his position, Fortune made clear that she did not yet wish to abandon her character for instability, and that Bacon had too much worth to remain so long prosperous. It thus came about that amongst the great number of officials such as a man of his position must have in his house, there was one who was accused before Parliament of exaction, and of having sold the influence that he might have with his master. And though the probity of M. Bacon was entirely exempt from censure, nevertheless he was declared guilty of the crime of his servant, and was deprived of the power that he had so long exercised



with so much honour and glory. In this I see the working of monstrous ingratitude and unparalleled cruelty ; to say that a man who could mark the years of his life, rather by the signal services that he had rendered to the State, than by times or seasons, should have received such hard usage, for the punishment of a crime which he never committed ; England, indeed, teaches us by this that the sea, that surrounds her shores, imparts to her inhabitants somewhat of its restless inconstancy. This storm did not at all surprise him, and he received the news of his disgrace with a countenance so undisturbed that it was easy to see that he thought but little of the sweets of life, since the loss of them caused him discomfort so slight. He had, fairly close to London, a country house replete with everything requisite to soothe a mind embittered by public life, as was his, and weary of living in the turmoil of the great world. He returned thither to give himself up more completely to the study of his books, and to pass in repose, the remainder of his life. But as he seemed to have been born rather for the rest of mankind than for himself, and as by the want of public employment he could not give his work to the people, he wished at least to render himself of use by his writings and by his books ; worthy as these are to be in all the libraries of the world, and to rank with the most splendid works of antiquity.

" The history of Henry VII. is one of those works which we owe to his fall, a work so well received by the whole world, that one has wished for nothing so much as the continuation of the History of the other Kings. And even yet he would not have given opportunity for these regrets, had not death cut short his plans, and thus robbed us of a work that bid fair to put all the others to shame.

" The Natural History is also one of the fruits of

his idleness. The praiseworthy wish that he had, to pass by nothing but to connote the nature and qualities of all things, induced his mind to make researches which some learned men may perhaps have indicated to him, but which none but himself could properly carry out. In which he has without doubt achieved so great a success, that but little has escaped his knowledge, so that he has laid bare to us the errors of the ancient Philosophy and made us see the abuses that have crept into that teaching, under the authority of the first authors of the science. But whilst he was occupied in this great work, want of means forced him to concentrate his mind on his domestic affairs. The honest manner in which he had lived was the sole cause of his poverty ; and as he was ever more desirous of acquiring honour than of amassing a fortune, he had always preferred the interests of the State to those of his house ; and had neglected, during the time of his great prosperity, the opportunities of enriching himself : So that after some years passed in solitude he found himself reduced to such dire necessity that he was constrained to have recourse to the King, to obtain, by his liberality, some alleviation of his misery. I know not if poverty be the mother of beauty, but I aver that the letter he wrote to the King on that occasion is one of the most beautiful examples of that style of writing ever seen. The request that he made for a pension is conceived in terms so lofty and in such good taste, that one could not deny him without great injustice. Having thus obtained the means to extricate himself from his difficulties, he again applied himself, as before, to unravel the great secrets of nature. And as he was engaged during a severe frost in observing some particular effects of cold, having stayed too long in the open, and forgetting that his age made him incapable of bearing such severities ; the



cold, acting the more easily on a body whose powers were already reduced by old age, drove out all that remained of natural heat, and reduced him to the last condition that is always reached by great men only too soon. Nature failed him while he was chanting her praise : this she did, perhaps, because, being miserly and hiding from us her best, she feared that at last he would discover all her treasures, and make all men learned at her expense. Thus ended this great man, whom England could place alone as the equal [*en parallele avec*] of the best of all the previous centuries."

---

### HIS FINAL DRAMA.

THERE is much to indicate that Bacon's last play had for a long time been premeditated. It was never printed, but it was intended to have all the world for its stage.

#### ACT I. SCENE I. "DISTRESS."

Bacon's tremendous powers of work as Lord Chancellor and his zeal for giving quick justice to the nation had largely to do with the attack by Parliament, but mainly directed against him by the Common Law Judges, officials and practitioners. Fees and presents had been diverted to the Chancery from the Common Law Courts by litigants, who desired celerity in disposal of their suits, but the Lord Chancellor administered justice justly. He was impeached, effectually replied to the charges, but, for the sake of reformation, requested to be condemned.

The nation had committed an act of "monstrous ingratitude and unparalleled cruelty" ('') so he had no further desire to serve the State. King James,

his close personal friend, on whose behalf Bacon had virtually ruled the nation since 1603, took care to terminate the imprisonment after two days and to assign the £40,000 fine to trustees nominated by Bacon as a protection against the pressure of specialty and simple contract creditors, whose claims through loss of his income he could no longer provide for.

It is pointed out by Rawley <sup>(2)</sup> that the offices of Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor, "though same in authority and power, yet differed in patent, height and favour of the prince." The position of Lord Chancellor was next in order of precedence to the Royal Family. The warrant for the King's Pardon to Bacon was dated October 12th, 1621. It will be found that the King secretly restored Bacon to the dignity of Lord Chancellor, although the judicial work and emoluments of the office were given to a new Lord Keeper. In 1622 Bacon printed "Othello." Whatever it had been as a performed play, as a *printed* one it was a comment on the apparent ingratitude of the nation. Pushkin, the Russian poet, had the necessary clarity to perceive that the Moor Othello was not jealous, but trustful. Desdemona idealised the English nation Bacon had worked for, loved and trusted, but which on the face of things, had abused his confidence and trust. Steadily working in retirement at his literary productions Bacon became at length very short of money. In March, 1625, the King, his friend, died, the pension he had granted Bacon was much in arrear, so that he only kept himself from immediate ignominy by borrowing.

Then Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia, resident in Holland with her dethroned husband, being there supported by a subsidy of £12,000 per annum from England, appeared upon the scene in August, 1625. In writing to Bacon, in a previous letter she had



subscribed herself "your very affectionate friend." All that Bacon's preserved reply to the letter of August, 1625, disclosed was, that she had offered him "*a great favour.*" Thereupon Bacon put in operation his long contemplated and dramatic scheme. His marriage had been a failure. The young wife had soon tired of the old poet philosopher, her husband, always concentrated upon state affairs or his books.

Tell me thou lov'st elsewhere, but in my sight,  
Dear heart forbear to glance thine eye aside. (3)

He decided to carry out his wish to die to the world "in St. Alban's habit as he lived" (4). No man of his day had ever watched over his own health with the intensity and care that Bacon did. He could relieve the pains of gout in two hours by one of his own prescriptions (5). But if he was going to "die to the world" he must first be "ill" to the world. In that day illness was called "sickness." Of this more anon.

When he "died," as his literary vizard of "Euphues" ("Dying to live," he called it) in the 1592 edition of *Rosalynde*, title-paged to Lodge, he had previously carried out various preparations to lull the public mind. He had made similar preparations of the imagination of "inferiour Readers" when he also died as "Watson" and as "Greene." In the character of Falstaffe he had discussed the ethic of "dying to live" in the play of Henry IV. first part:—"But to counterteit dying, when a man thereby liveth, is to be no counterfeite, but the true and perfect image of life indeed."

So he "*went sick*" in the autumn of 1625. His reply to the Queen of Bohemia stated that he was "ill of a dangerous and tedious sickness." He did not explain that he meant "old age!" Bacon dissembled, but did not lie. To Mr. Palmer, on October 29th, he wrote, "I have obtained some

degree of health." To Sir Humphrey May :—" I shall not be able in respect of my health to attend a Parliament. I wish you a good New Year." To Buckingham, " I have gotten some degree of health. I wish your Grace a good New Year."

In a carefully schemed Will, dated December 21st, 1625, published in the presence of his chaplain, Rawley and other servants who signed their names, he directed his Executors, " To have a special care to discharge a debt by bond (now made in my sickness) to Mr. Thomas Meautys." The main practical effect of the Will was to make his estate absolutely freed from the priority of the £40,000 fine or Crown debt, so that his specialty and simple contract creditors should have all the estate he had available, which eventuated in their getting about 8s. in the £. Those who had lent at high interest of course did better, as also did those who had advanced less than the nominal amounts.

For the general public whom gossip might not have reached, he printed about January, 1625-6, two little books, " Apophthegmes," prefaced " for recreation in my sickness," and " Translations of Psalms," prefaced " his poor exercise of my sickness."

## SCENE II. THE " DEATH."

Having thus thoroughly prepared the public to *expect his death*, Francis came up from Gorhambury to London and stayed at his Gray's Inn Chambers. The next we hear is that when snow was on the ground at the beginning of April, he " casually repaired " <sup>(6)</sup> to the Earl of Arundel's house at Highgate. Norden tells about this country seat on high ground some miles from the city of London <sup>(7)</sup>. It was remote and had fine views of the surrounding country. Bacon knew it well, both when Sir William Cornwallis owned it and afterwards. The Countess of Arundel gave a



banquet there in Bacon's honour in 1617. There was only a caretaker in the house. At the time of Bacon's visit its owner, the Earl of Arundel, was a temporary prisoner in the Tower. As a youth Arundel had been a ward of Bacon's brother, Robert Earl of Essex, whose remains he, Arundel, took away for burial after Robert had been beheaded on Tower Green in 1601. He was a great friend of the Queen of Bohemia, and of Francis Bacon, educated his family in Holland, and was a rich patron of the fine arts. His library was eventually given to the Royal Society. In 1680 in his life of Hobbes, Aubrey relates, on the authority of Hobbes, a story of Bacon and Dr. Witheybourne, the King's physician (correctly Sir John Wedderburn) taking a coach drive to Highgate in the snow and then stopping to stuff snow into a newly killed fowl, whereby Bacon caught a chill and was two or three days at Highgate House before he died! In a life of Sir Julius Cæsar, quoted by Montagu <sup>(8)</sup> it is stated that Bacon died in Cæsar's arms. Montagu also states (but gives no authority) that Cæsar was sent for to Highgate House when Bacon was taken ill.

In 1702, in Stephen's collection of Bacon's letters, we are given Bacon's account <sup>(9)</sup> of his "illness," though not in his handwriting. The document was printed in Sir Tobie Matthews' collection. According to this, Bacon had nearly lost his life in an experiment in the induration of a body, etc. Then Rawley once more <sup>(10)</sup> lets us know that Bacon died in the early morning of the 9th April, a day on which was commemorated the resurrection of our Saviour, etc. Lloyd's Statesmen, 1665, stated that Bacon made *in effect* his last bed at Cæsar's house. Fuller's "Worthies," 1662, says the same. From Montagu <sup>(11)</sup> are two other fragments of information:—"History of Life and Death"; "The condensation by *Flight*

is when there is antipathy between the spirit and the body upon which it acts as in *Opium* . . . a grain will tranquilize the nerves and by a few grains they may be so compressed as to be irrecoverable. The *Touched Spirit* may *Retreat* into its *Shell* for a time or for ever." Where Montagu obtained this make-believe translation has yet to be found out.

The other fragment quoted by Montagu is from the *Ad. of Learning*, 1640 :—

"Wherefore voluptuous men often turn into *friars* and the declining age of ambitious *princes* is commonly more sad and *besieged with Melancholy*."

The late Mrs. Pott wrote that the name of Bacon's own physician, Dr. Parry, has been associated with the "death," but did not give her authority.

Piecing these fragments together, we can expect that Bacon's body was indurated, that is to say, was put under an opiate, which proved nearly too much for him. That he was shown to the simple caretaker on the early morning of April 9th as seemingly dead in Cæsar's arms; that he was carried away in a rough coffin (shell) nearly dying on the journey, and taken to Cæsar's house (he owned one near the St. Catherine dock on the Thames) where Francis was suitably restored. That dressed in the habit of a French friar he sailed abroad, doubtless to Holland. His close friend and late secretary, Sir Thomas Meautys would be concerned in the proceedings, and he would spread abroad the allegation that the Viscount was dead.

---

### SCENE III. HIS "FUNERALLS."

There is no record of any funeral nor any entry upon a register of burials of the burial of Francis Bacon. Meautys, writing in April, 1626, to Lady Jane (Corn-



wallis) Bacon upon the delicate subject of a loan from her, added, "My Ld. St. Alban is dead and buried." Other persons gave out that he was dead (<sup>12</sup>).

The omission of record of "funeral rites" was partly atoned for by the publication by Rawley, in 1626, of thirty-three Latin Dirges at his (Bacon's) untimely death. They were called "Manes Verulamiani." One of these dirge writers was so overcome, that he said, "He is gone. He is gone. *I have not said he is dead.*"

At this point reference might usefully be made to Johphiel's remarks in Ben Jonson's "Masque of the Fortunate Isles," in folio of 1640, written, but not performed, and to the Repertorie of Records, 1631.

---

ACT II. SCENE I. "THE DESERTED CHAPLAIN."

Whatever he may have suspected, it is doubtful whether Rawley (then a Court Chaplain) knew of Bacon's flight until some years later. According to the biliteral cipher written by him (<sup>13</sup>) he had charge of Bacon's "Shakespeare" Manuscripts and of his "Spenser" manuscripts with instructions to get them into the respective tomb monuments of those worthy vizards. But Bacon had not had time to see his "Sylva Sylvarum" and "New Atlantis" through the press, though he had written the preface to the former work. Rawley, who took charge, made a bungle of this preface when he published the work in 1627. In 1629 Rawley printed some Miscellany Works of his lordship, viz., "Holy War," "War With Spain," and two unfinished fragments, evidently to convey a cypher message.

The pamphlets he had probably copied for himself, being interested as a clergyman; the fragments were, one would expect, unfinished drafts he had taken down at his lordship's dictation. I doubt if Bacon

knew that Rawley had these papers. In accordance with the "Will" of 1625, all Bacon's manuscripts and papers were sealed up and despatched to Mr. Boswell, the English agent at the Hague. It is certain that in the preface to the Miscellany Works, 1629, and in the biliteral cypher which Rawley inserted, he writes of Bacon as dead and sleeping in his tombe (<sup>14</sup>). But growing acquaintance with the methods of the Rosicrosse fraternity enables one to see that its members do not hesitate to *dissemble truth* if they provide the truth in an occult form besides the dissembling statement. Rawley, however, does not appear to have done this in the 1629 publication.

Rawley did not come into action again over Bacon's acknowledged writings until Aelius Deodate (avocat) who one would take to have been Bacon's French lawyer, came over to London from Paris, in 1632, with a request that Rawley would prepare a Latin edition of certain of Bacon's works.

This was agreed to, and was accomplished in 1638. Here we must leave Rawley. He comes on the scene again in 1651-8, but of this later.

---

ACT II. SCENE II. "BACON IN RETREAT."

Charles Molloy, who after Rawley's death in 1667, printed the 1671 edition of "Resuscitatio," prefaced that Bacon "made a *holy* and *humble retreat* into the cool shades of rest, where he remained triumphant above fate and fortune till heaven was pleased to summon him to a more glorious and triumphant rest." We may gather from this that Bacon had before 1671 *actually died* and had until then lived the holy and humble life of a friar. With his complete knowledge of French and his guise as a friar he could have most excellently concealed his identity.



One may assume that at first he took matters quietly. But he soon had something to do. Another edition of the "Anatomy of Melancholy" was required by his publisher, Cripps of Oxford. Francis prepared the edition of 1628, inserted more biliteral cypher which he signed "Francis St. Alban," furnished a frontispiece (the plate being engraved by a foreigner, C. le Blon) and added 102 extra pages. On one of these he stated, "I will not hereafter add, alter, or retract. *I have done.*" Nevertheless he found himself obliged to prepare an edition in 1632 and again in 1638. No wonder that he jocularly said in the 1640 Ad. of Learning, that he was "besieged with Melancholy" in his declining age.

The letter Meautys sent to Bacon (<sup>15</sup>) dealing with just happened events in 1631, shows that Bacon at that date was in friendly association with titled friends, some of whom were especial friends of Meautys.

In 1629-30 Francis would be writing the French "Sylva," printed 1631. Particularly noticeable is the prominence he gave to his title of *Lord Chancellor*, and that he mentioned facts concerning himself which *could have been known to him alone*. James Gruter, in 1648, brought in parts of the French "Sylva" when he printed in Latin the English "Sylva Sylvarum." Rawley was alarmed at this, as appears by the Gruter letters in BACONIANA, 1679. The 1656 "History of King Charles I.," which stops at May 11th, 1641, has on its F.B., or 62nd page, the words:—"Secondly *the then* (1626) *and last Lord Chancellor*, Sir Francis Bacon, etc."

By its marks in printer's ornaments and certain numbers, the "History of Charles I., 1656," had a Rosicrosse origin.

D. M., the anonymous author of the French "Sylva," suggests "*Democritus*," the name under which Francis

wrote the "Anatomy of Melancholy." The Privilege du Roy for the French "Sylva" was granted to one, Pierre Amboise, who immediately assigned his rights to the publishers. His name was of purpose incorrectly given in Ad. of Learning, 1640, as author of the French "Sylva."

It is manifest that D. M., in the Epistre, correctly complained of Rawley having printed in a *confused manner* "all the papers that he found in his cabinet." When Rawley finished the oversight of the "Sylva Sylvarum," and had blundered over the Preface, his work was done, until specially employed in 1632 to prepare a Latin collection of Bacon's works.

Bacon would, I expect, edit the 1632 book of six Lyly Comedies, and supply the lyrics not in the quartos. He revised certain of his philosophical manuscripts, left them with Boswell for custody, and these were by Boswell (after Bacon's death and before his own death in 1649) entrusted to Isaac Gruter. They were printed by Gruter in 1653 (*Scripta in Naturali*, etc.).

Mr. Edwin Reed has noted (<sup>16</sup>) the careful omissions from the published "Cogitata" of passages which Bacon wrote in 1607, and of which he had submitted MS. copies to his friends, Bodley and Bishop Andrews. The important revelations in Bodley's reply have already been given in this magazine.

Friar Francis also revised the English Ad. of Learning, 1640, nominally the work of Wats. To Francis may also be ascribed the three pamphlets printed anonymously in 1638, "Discovery of a New World," which, after Bishop Wilkins' death, were title-paged to Wilkins.

"Mercury, or the Swift and Secret Messenger," was one of Bacon's last works half ascribed in 1641 to "Mercury Junior" and half to Wilkins, who seems to have become its foster-father.

## ACT II. SCENE III. "REST."

Sir Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam, Viscount St. Alban, Lord Chancellor of England, died actually in the year 1641, at the age of 81. The proof of this is abundant and cumulative. I ask Baconians to search books for further confirmation. In the "Resuscitatio," 1657, and the subsequent editions of 1661 and 1671, is an engraved portrait of Bacon. At its foot is a statement in italics about his death. There are exactly 81 italic letters in the statement. In Rawley's "Life of the Honourable Author," in the short paragraph which begins, "He died," and ends with "age," there are 22 italic words and seven Roman words. Deduct the smaller number and the remainder is 15, which, added to the year of death, gives 1641, and added to the age gives 81. At page 134 of "Fuller's Worthies," 1662, is given the inscription on the tomb tablet to "Democritus Junior" at Christ Church, Oxford. It contains 81 italic letters. On page 259 of BACONIANA, 1679, which gives the sentence, "Let the Companions be parted in the year of our Lord, 1626, and the sixty-sixth year of his age" there are 81 whole words in Roman type. Number 259 is the Kay count of "Shakespeare," and the simple count of "Christian Rosenkreutz."

The great "Historical Dictionary," 1691, states that Bacon was Lord Chancellor 19 years. Adding 1622 to 19 gives the age at death as 1641. No new Lord Chancellor was appointed until Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, was given the office at Bruges, on January 13th, 1657-8, before Charles II. came to the throne, thus showing that it was not necessarily more than a title of honour.

Stephens, in his 1702 edition of Bacon's letters, gives the age of death in a neat piece of dissembling. Bacon's birthday, January 22nd, 1660-1, is mentioned by Stephens and his alleged death day, 9th April, 1626



Says Stephens, Bacon died aged 65 years, 2 months and about 14 days. Of course the number of days should be 18. But add  $65 + 2 + 14$  and you get 81 years of age. The most sacred symbol in Freemasonry, says Carlisle, is the number 81.

Finally, in 1741, *one century after the date of death*, the statue to "Shakespeare" was placed in Westminster Abbey. The extract on the scroll held by the figure is from the "Tempest," but garbled so as to reduce it to 157 letters. The head note is contrived so as to show 54 letters. 54 is the simple count of Fr. Bacon, and 157 the simple count of Fra. Rosicrosse.

---

#### EPILOGUE.

From Tenison's extract of the contents of Bacon's last Will and from Rawley's own statement that another person had been appointed to give the "In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethæ," in English, it is obvious that he was not directly entrusted with Bacon's remaining manuscripts and papers. They were, perhaps, given to his custody by the literary overseers, John Selden and Edward Herbert, of the Inner Temple. In 1651 he would appear to have had charge of them and printed the "Resuscitatio," 1657 and 1661, and the "Opuscula," 1658. He died in 1667 and the papers passed to the custody of the Rev. Thomas Tenison, afterward Archbishop of Canterbury.

Bacon at one time looked upon life as a comedy :—

"Why the same thing happens in the Comedy and Theatre of this world, where some play the Emperors, others the Bishops, and lastly all the parts that may be in a Comedy."

"Don Quixote," 2nd part, 1615.

In 1621, when the English nation for which he had worked all his life, misled by a greedy faction, had

turned against him, he formed another view. So that in 1623, in making a selection of "Shakespeare" Comedies, Histories and Tragedies for folio publication he *included only 35 in his Catalogue*. The tragedy of "Troilus and Cressida" unpagged to show it was a stop-gap, was placed between the Histories and Tragedies, as it were temporarily, until the drama of his (Bacon's) whole life had been played to its end.

The place intended for the drama of his life was, however, no longer amongst the Comedies. He showed that he classified it as something akin to a History, but more so to a Tragedy. <sup>(17)</sup>

PARKER WOODWARD.

#### NOTES.

1. "Discourse, L'Histoire Naturelle," 1631.
2. "Resuscitatio' Life of Bacon."
3. "Shakespeare's Sonnets," 1609, No. 139.
4. When made viscount.
- 5 and 6. Rawley's "Life of Bacon."
7. "Norden's Survey," 1596.
8. Montagu Vol. 17, p. 424.
9. Page 301.
10. "Life of Bacon."
11. Vol. 17, p. 418, probably taken from the 1650 edition.
12. See BACONIANA, 1914, p. 96, article by Miss Leith.
- 13 and 14. Lost MSS. (Gallup), p. 48.
15. Montagu Vol. 12, p. 492.
16. "F. Bacon our Shakespeare."
17. A letter on page 252 of Tobie Matthews' Collection ends as follows:—

"Or rather this Beeing of ours, is not so properlie a Life as a Play, and God onely is He who can tell us whether it shall prove a Tragedy or a Comedy in the end."

## THE FRENCH "SYLVA," 1631.

I AM indebted to Mr. Cuninghame for again drawing attention to this book, criticised in his "Bacon's Secret Disclosed," and in Mr. Begley's "Nova Resuscitatio."

Its title is "Histoire Naturelle de Mre. Francois Bacon, Baron de Verulan, Vicomte de Saint Alban et Chancelier d'Angleterre." It contains :—

A Dedication to M. de Chasteauneuf, signed D. M.

Address to the Reader. (Epistre.)

Licence to print. (Privilege du Roy.)

Discourse on the Life of M. Francis Bacon, Chancellor of England.

Verses by M. Auvray, Advocat en Parliament, à Monsieur Bacon Chancelier d'Angleterre sur son Histoire Naturelle traduit par le sieur.—D. M.

An abridgment of the English Sylva Sylvarum in French with alterations and additions.

A translation of the "New Atlantis."

Verulam it will be noticed is misspelt, one would think deliberately, as "Alban" is spelt correctly.

The translator makes great play with Chancelier. From 1622 until 1657-8 Francis has been the only Lord Chancellor.

To myself, accustomed to Bacon's dedications, the Epistre reads like an old friend :—

"Your name on the front of this work will make it last throughout centuries." This treasure of history had been *discovered* by D. M., with all its fine embellishments it had formerly obtained from his (Baconian) pen during Chasteauneuf's Embassy. Chasteauneuf was in England on special Embassy in 1629-30. D. M. would have us believe that he had found a print of the Rawley "Sylva" annotated by the author. "It would



have been easy for this great man to have found a better pen than mine to have shown forth his Genius."

"These are the *fruits* of a land where you have shown those of your prudence." "Your most humble and most obedient servant, D. M.

"Address to the reader." affirms the work, though posthumous, to be as genuine as works published by the author when living. The author had done better than Aristotle, Pliny and Cardan, and other Ancients who had written upon the subject. If he had used in the translation many words more Latin than French, D. M. blamed the sterility of "our language" which he found "deficient."

He "had not followed exactly the order observed in the original English work, because its matter seemed broken up rather by caprice than reason."

Yet Rawley, in the English Sylva Sylvarum, had copied Bacon's Preface, and a man does not usually write a Preface to a book divided into 10 Centuries and 1,000 particulars, until it is finished. Rawley could not, or rather did not, propose to explain why his lordship had not put these particulars into any "exact method," but added that "he that looks attentively shall find that they have a secret order."

D. M. continues, that being aided for the most part by the manuscripts of the author: "I have deemed it necessary to add to or to take away many of the things that have been omitted or added by the Chaplain of Mr. Bacon, who printed in a confused manner all the papers that he found in his cabinet. I say this so that those who understand English will not accuse me of inaccuracy when they encounter in my translation many things that they do not find in the original."

This looks as if Bacon only entrusted to Rawley the Sylva and one or two other papers not wanted else-

where. Rawley printed these papers in the "confused manner" noticeable in "Certaine Miscellany Works, 1629." The 1625 Will affords a clue to the elsewhere. Mr. Boswell, whose name is, I think, with design spelt "Bosvile" in the Will, was a diplomatist interested mostly in the literature of the East. Boswell was English agent at the Hague, and thus a friendly consignee of the bulk of important MSS., until Bacon could take charge of them.

Bacon was an adept in deceiving the "inferior reader," yet telling the truth all the time.

How could "D. M.", unless he were Bacon himself, have acquired such inside knowledge of the private affairs entrusted to Rawley?

Bacon, as D. M., deemed it necessary to alter and add to the English "Sylva," yet assured his English readers that the new facts and observations *were true*.

It is not necessary to dwell on the "Privilege du Roy" to Pierre Amboise to translate, and publish, but as it was undesirable in the 1640 Ad. of Learning to raise debate as to the identity of "D. M.", Master Pierre Amboise was credited with having made the translation.

"The Discourse on the Life of M. Francis Bacon" is manifestly a discourse by Bacon himself.

The great man had been cruelly wronged, and took an early opportunity of setting himself right with foreign nations and his own countrymen of a future age. None but Bacon knew that he was "great in birth and possessions"; that "many of his ancestors had left marks of their greatness in history" (his great grandfather, Henry VII. to wit); "that he was born in the purple" (son of Queen Elizabeth); "brought up with the expectation of a great career"; that he had travelled in Italy and Spain (France would be known

about) ; and " saw himself destined to hold the helm of the kingdom."

Bacon was most interested to affirm that he was a good man and an upright judge, and the introduction of the word " Fashions " shows that none but he could have seen the Bodley to Bacon letter of 1581, and none but he have known of the MS. Notes on the States of Christendom, or have told that he had soon learnt all that College could teach him.

Who else but Bacon and the then late King James had access to the letter of 1622 in which Bacon begged for help. It was not printed until 1645.

Still more, who else would recognise and acclaim its great literary quality for that style of writing ! Bacon, like the writer of the Discourse, had an immense belief in the pre-eminent greatness of Francis Bacon from the time he left College.

The amusing part of the business is that the belief was entirely justified.

As to this attitude of mind, remember his controversy with the Queen over the subsidies in which he held firmly to his own correct action, and his justification of his course of conduct with regard to his brother Essex. Condemned by the House of Lords, he maintained in his letter to Buckingham that though the decision was for reformation's sake fit, and that he had partaken of the abuses of the times he had been the justest judge since Sir Nicholas Bacon.

As " D. M." he shows that having reached the summit of Learning and Virtue it was fitting that he should also reach that of Dignity. So ignoring the whole period 1581-1603 he demonstrates that until his fall, he, as a matter of fact, both ruled and guided the Kingdom. No one can dispute this. Passing on to the time of his impeachment he rests his trouble upon one servant. That was a very ingenious way of accusing his officials



and servants generally. It left each to apply to himself as much of the accusation as his conscience admitted. His servant Bushel had already confessed their responsibility and accused Hastings.

Churchill, the Registrar, whom Bacon discharged for fraud, was a bad man who revenged his discharge by raking everything he could collect to bolster up the case against the Chancellor, and, of course, did not care. The Chancery work at that time fell almost solely upon Bacon. Litigants found their business went through quicker in Chancery, and deserted the Common Law Courts.

Bacon was a prodigious worker, so everybody who could went to the Chancery Court. A good deal of interesting work was done at York House. (A modern example would be the rush to the Rolls Court and its officials in Sir George Jessel's time). Litigants showered their money and gifts which Bacon tolerated as a practice of the time, and left much of this dealing to his officials. What he did not do, but what his people did occasionally, and that unknown to him, was to promise decrees in favour of those who made gifts.

Bacon all the time was deciding the cases on their merits. When the storm fell upon him he was right in his "D. M." point of view that the action against him (engineered by jealous Common Law Judges and pleaders whose profits were seriously encroached upon) was a piece of "monstrous ingratitude" on the part of the nation and an act of "unparalleled cruelty" to him. In the result, he dropped out of public service and retired to his books, though his books did not furnish bread and meat, so this proud man had to beg. Finally "D.M." adds a word about his "death" due, he said, to a cold caught during a severe frost. Here he is cleverly ambiguous, because colds are not usually caught during *severe* frosts. That he had intended

to print letters which would include and cover the Highgate House letter as to his "illness" is probable, but he must have finally decided not to do so. In conclusion of the Discourse he wrote, "Voila quelle fut  
" la fin de ce grand personage quel Angleterre peut  
" mettre seul en parallele avec les plus excellens  
" hommes de tous les siecles precedens."

That was the high pinnacle on which Bacon put himself in the 1623 Folio as "Shakespeare." Ben Jonson put him one stage higher in writing his "Discoveries." I take the "Discourse" to be a full vindication by Bacon of his own career and merit given without fig leaves, and adorned with the beautiful poetic imagery which characterises his writings as a whole. Here he alludes to the instability of Fortune, likens the English to the inconstancy of the seas surrounding their shores, and makes, concerning the manner of his death, the delightful remark:—"Nature failed him, while he was chanting her praise."

In the body of the Sylva Abridgement mention is made of matters only known to him, such as what he had heard and seen in Scotland, and his knowledge of the writer of Amleth (Saxo Grammaticus). The only possible other explanation may be that Bacon left behind another "Sylva" and that someone impossible to identify, when he came to discourse on Bacon's life was in full possession of his most intimate secrets, and was as clever a poet as the author he wrote about. But this I do not for one moment believe. My brother and I have examined a copy of "L'Histoire Naturelle" and find it has many marks of Baconian or Rosicrosse origin. There are colons in the printers' ornament, the numerical sigils, 33 and 157, are on the title page, and 287 is shown on the last page of the "Epistre." Several pages are wrongly numbered, the total of the figures omitted is 282, which is the K. cipher count

of "Francis Bacon." "D. M." may have stood for Democritus Junior, his pen-name in "Anatomy of Melancholy."

It follows that Bacon was alive in 1631, and had with him abroad such manuscripts as he wanted.

PARKER WOODWARD.

---

## A LIFE OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

"It is abundantly proved that a gentle modesty was an abiding note of Shakespeare's character."—*Sir Sidney Lee*.

IN making this assertion on page 186 of the latest edition of his book, entitled, *A Life of William Shakespeare* (a very misleading title for this work of over 700 pages), Sir Sidney Lee cannot have had in mind the "abiding note" of the character of *his* Shakespeare, for, as his book shows, "John Shakespeare's eldest son" was neither gentle nor modest. If Sir Sidney Lee were judging the character of the author of the plays and poems, and endeavouring to identify that author upon the merits of the works alone he could come to no other conclusion than Emerson's, viz., that the poet, as revealed by his writings, was "the best bred gentleman in England."

It is an interesting and really amusing exercise to summarise the incidents of the player's life as recorded by his most distinguished biographer. The latest edition of this work covers more than 700 pages, and as all the facts recorded about Sir Sidney Lee's "Shakespeare" do not warrant more than a hundredth part of this bulk, the bread is quite obscured by the intol-



able deal of sack, so eagerly drunk off by the unapprehending public.

The facts are so swamped in this flood of printers' ink that it is a matter of time to draw them out. But it is worth bringing them into the light, because the judgment is then enabled to weigh the evidence as to the probability, or improbability, of this man being the author of "Shakespeare."

Sir Sidney Lee is the generalissimo of orthodox Shakespeareans. Let us see how "the poet" appears in the beam of the searchlight.

It is assumed that Shakespeare (as he is called) "probably made his entry" to the Grammar School at Stratford in 1571. But there is not a scrap of evidence here. Had "the greatest head of the universe" (as Emerson terms the author of *Hamlet*) been a student there, his precocity would have created such a sensation in the village that gossip would have been kept alive for several generations. But far from being of a studious disposition, we are disappointed to learn (page 33):—

There is small doubt, too, that his sporting experiences passed at times beyond orthodox limits. Some practical knowledge of the art of poaching seems to be attested by Shakespeare's early lines:—

What ! hast thou not full often struck a doe  
And borne her cleanly by the keeper's nose.

This is from *Titus Andronicus*, in which "Shakespeare's hand is only visible in detached embellishments" (p. 129). A footnote to this page reads: "Mr. J. M. Robertson, in his *Did Shakespeare Write Titus Andronicus?* (1905), ably questions Shakespeare's responsibility at any point."

No inconsistency is found between the young

Stratford rustic's amours in his native district, and the conduct we should have expected from the author of the exquisitely courteous comedies :—

This morning, like the spirit of a youth,  
That means to be of note, begins betimes.

On page 29, of this Life of Shakespeare, we read :—

The prominence of the Shottery husbandmen in the negotiations preceding Shakespeare's marriage suggests the true position of affairs. Sandells and Richardson, representing the lady's family, doubtless secured the deed on their own initiative, so that Shakespeare might have small opportunity of evading a step which his intimacy with their friend's daughter had rendered essential to her reputation. The wedding probably took place, without the consent of the bridegroom's parents—it may be without their knowledge—soon after the signing of the deed. The scene of the ceremony was clearly outside the bounds of Stratford parish—in an unidentified church of the Worcester diocese, the register of which is lost.

Within six months of the marriage bond—in May, 1583,—a daughter was born to the poet.

And this man is hailed as the creator of *Miranda* and *Imogen* ! who wrote :—

Good name in man or woman, dear my lord,  
Is the immediate jewel of their souls.

According to Sir Sidney Lee, Shakespeare “repeatedly ridicules the craze for foreign travel . . . His Italian scenes *lack the intimate detail* which would attest a first-hand experience of the country.” Well, there is a play called *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, in which it is said to be “a great impeachment” to a man's age, “having known no travel in his youth.” Antonio declares that his son, Proteus,

cannot be a perfect man  
Not being tried and tutor'd in the world,

and so the boy is to be sent abroad to

Hear sweet discourse, converse with noblemen,  
And be in the eye of every exercise  
Worthy his youth and nobleness of birth.

As for the alleged lack of intimate detail in his Italian scenes, other commentators, who probably knew as much about Italy as Sir Sidney Lee, vouch for Shakespeare's accuracy. Thus the famous Danish Shakespearean, Dr. George Brandes, observes that :—" In the *Taming of the Shrew*, we notice with surprise not only the correctness of the Italian names, but the remarkable way in which, at the very beginning of the play, several Italian cities and districts are characterised in a single phrase. Lombardy is ' the pleasant garden of great Italy ' ; Pisa is ' renowned for grave citizens ' ; and here the epithet ' grave ' is especially noteworthy, since many testimonies concur to show that it was particularly characteristic of the inhabitants of Pisa. C. A. Brown, in *Shakespeare's Autobiographical Poems*, has pointed out the remarkable form of the betrothal of Petruchio and Katharina (namely, that her father joins their hands in the presence of two witnesses), and observes that this form was not English, but peculiarly Italian. It is not found in the older play, the scene of which, however, is laid in Athens."

Of the speech at the end of the second act, where Gremio reckons up all the goods and gear with which his house is stocked, Dr. Brandes states that " Lady Morgan long ago remarked that she had seen literally all of these articles of luxury in the palaces of Venice, Genoa, and Florence. Miss Martineau, in ignorance



alike of Brown's theory and Lady Morgan's observation, expressed to Shakespeare's biographer, Charles Knight, her feeling that the local colour of the *Taming of the Shrew* and the *Merchant of Venice* displays such an *intimate* acquaintance, not only with the manners and customs of Italy, but with the *minutest details* of domestic life, that it cannot possibly have been gleaned from books or from mere conversations with this man or that who happened to have floated in a gondola."

According to one Shakespearean, therefore, the poet's knowledge of Italy and her people is lacking in "*intimate detail*," while another insists that he had "*an intimate acquaintance*" with the "*minutest details*" of Italian life! Sir Sidney Lee agrees, however, that "he was well read in the romances of Italy, and that his reading was not entirely through French or English translations" (p. 98). But as to what period of his life "John Shakespeare's eldest son" studied the Italian language, and found time for that "wide reading in both classical and recent domestic literature" (p. 143), we are not enlightened. Nor does Sir Sidney suggest where his Shakespeare obtained the necessary library. Yet "doubtless" the poet made notes or marks in "the margents of such books." (*Lucrece*, 102).

On page 97 of the "Life" occurs one of the most curious assertions of any in the book:—"Shakespeare must be credited with the production, during these twenty years (1591-1611) of a yearly average of two plays, nearly all of which belong to the supreme rank of literature. Three volumes of poems must be added to the total. . . . Signs of hasty workmanship are not lacking, but they are few when it is considered how rapidly his numerous compositions came from his pen." How long does Sir Sidney Lee

imagine that it took Shakespeare to turn out a play? Apparently about six months, and this without having the labour of shaping and inventing his plot. This is called "prolific industry!" And yet on the previous page mention is made of Thomas Heywood, who claimed to have had a hand in more than 220 plays, "although his literary labours were by no means confined to drama. In his elaborate *Apology for Actors* (1612) he professed pride in his actor's vocation, from which, despite his other employments, he never dissociated himself."

The total number of plays by Lope de Vega is unknown. He himself put it down as 1,500. His early biographer talked of 300 more. About 430 are actually extant. This is, indeed, "prolific industry," but if Shakespeare wrote one play in six months (instead of, as is more likely, less than six days) it is pretty certain that his lines would have none of that easy-flowing grace which makes them so delightful to the ear, nor would his papers have appeared "without a blot in them."

We are told how Shakespeare readily "absorbed and transmuted into gold" the unvalued ore of other writers. Nobody can disagree with this, but it is significant that this was the admitted practice of Bacon who, said Dr. Rawley, "lighted his torch at every man's candles."

Among many important statements that may well be questioned, I would single out that on page 255:—

For several years his genius as dramatist and poet had been acknowledged by critics and playgoers alike, and his social and professional position had become considerable.

Perhaps the most striking contrast with Sir Sidney Lee's theory of Shakespeare as popular and honoured in his own time is to be found in Dr. C. M. Ingleby's

compilation of Allusions to Shakespeare, entitled, *Shakespeare's Centurie of Prayse*. Reviewing "the estimation in which Shakespeare was held by the writers of the century during which his fame was germinating, viz., 1592-1693," Dr. Ingleby writes:—

"The absence of sundry great names with which no pains of research, scrutiny, or study could connect the most trivial allusion to the bard or his works (such, *e.g.*, as Lord Brooke, Lord Bacon, Selden, Sir John Beaumont, Henry Vaughan, and Lord Clarendon) is *tacitly* significant: the iteration of the same vapid and affected compliments, couched in conventional terms, from writers of the first two periods, comparing Shakespeare's 'tongue,' 'pen,' or 'vein,' to silver, honey, sugar, or nectar, while they ignore his greater and distinguishing qualities, is *expressly* significant. It is plain for one thing that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of that age. . . . Assuredly no one during the 'Centurie' had any suspicion that the genius of Shakespeare was unique, and that he was *sui generis*—*i.e.*, the only exemplar of his species."

Emerson remarks, "If it need wit to know wit, according to the proverb, Shakespeare's time should be capable of recognising it. . . . Since the constellation of great men who appeared in Greece in the time of Pericles, there was never any such society; yet their genius failed them to find out the best head in the universe. Our poet's mask was impenetrable."

The biographer again insists on Shakespeare's contemporary recognition, and says that "the exceptional popularity of Shakespeare's work after 1599 gave him the full advantage of higher rates of pecuniary reward in all directions" (p 315). As to this "exceptional popularity," all that Dr. Ingleby can say is



that "those who ranked him very high compared him to Spenser, Sidney, Chapman, Jonson, Fletcher, and even lesser lights, and most of the judges of that time assigned the first place to one of them."

There is, of course, no evidence that the author of *Hamlet*, *Lear*, and the rest of those marvellous plays, ever received a penny for them. Nearly every other play-writer is mentioned as receiving "pecuniary reward" for dramatic work for Henslowe's Theatre, but although plays bearing similar titles to the Shakespeare dramas were produced, the name does not appear in the Diary, and I do not know upon what evidence Sir Sidney Lee bases his assertion. Further on (p. 503), we are told that, "With Shakespeare's literary power and his sociability, too, there clearly went the shrewd capacity of a man of business. Pope had just warrant for the surmise that he

For gain, not glory, winged his roving flight  
And grew immortal in his own despite.

His literary attainments and successes were chiefly valued as serving the prosaic end of making a permanent provision for himself and his daughters."

Here, indeed, is food for reflection! And the question we ask is, if the object of these "literary attainments" was merely to make money, and the author of them the maltster who sued Philip Rogers for two shillings lent, why did he allow advantage to be taken by others of his "successes" even to the detriment of his literary reputation? He took no action against the printers, publishers, poets, and dramatists who dispersed their writings under his name. This is an elementary objection to the theory that the plays were written for any "prosaic end," but it is unanswered and unanswerable. Then again,

most of the plays are far too lengthy for "the two hours' traffic" of the public theatre. About half of *Hamlet* or *Lear* could be read in that space of time. *Antony and Cleopatra* is, as written, quite unpresentable upon any stage. Apart from its great length, it consists of 42 scenes (Act IV., Scene 2 amounts to four lines !)

Each revision of the plays was calculated to enhance their value for the study, but it correspondingly impaired their adaptability to the stage. Was this done with "the shrewd capacity of a man of business?" The Stratford player is said, by tradition, to have performed the part of Adam in *As You Like It*. Would he not have winced somewhat when Orlando addressed him with these words :—

O good old man, how well in thee appears  
The constant service of the antique world,  
When service sweat for duty, not for meed !  
Thou art not for the fashion of these times,  
Where none will sweat but for promotion,  
And, having that, do choke their service up  
Even with the having.

This does not sound like the Shakespeare whose "life" has been through many editions. The gentle poet sneers at money as "trash," and landed possessions as "dirt,"—

Who steals my purse steals trash.

Tell her my love, more noble than the world,  
Prizes not quantity of dirty lands.

Dost know this water fly ? . . . 'tis a vice to know him. He hath much land and fertile ; let a beast be lord of beasts, and his crib shall stand at the King's mess. 'Tis a chough ; but, as I say, spacious in the possession of dirt.

If we separate the bare facts from their well-padded surroundings which make up this "Life" of Shakespeare, we realise the feelings of Richard Grant White, voicing the disappointment of his heart :—

"These stories grate upon our feelings. . . The pursuit of an impoverished man, for the sake of imprisoning him and depriving him, both of the power of paying his debt and supporting himself and his family, is an incident in Shakespeare's life which it requires the utmost allowance and consideration for the practice of the time and country to enable us to contemplate with equanimity—satisfaction is impossible. The biographer of Shakespeare must record these facts, because the literary antiquaries have unearthed and brought them forward as new particulars of the life of Shakespeare. We hunger, and we receive these husks ; we open our mouths for food, and we break our teeth against these stones."

The life of the Stratford man brings no food to his hungry idolaters. There is not recorded of him one noble or lovable action. All the facts which have been brought to light are sordid, mean, and base. Here are a few of the "husks" which find their way into Sir Sidney Lee's "Life of Shakespeare," a volume which journalists have trumpeted as "an honour to English scholarship, an almost perfect model of its kind, and a matter for great national rejoicing that the standard life of Shakespeare has at last been made in England"; "A marvel of research"; "Unquestionably one of the most remarkable achievements of modern English scholarship":

Shakespeare left Bishopsgate without discharging the debt (his taxes for St. Helen's parish). Soon afterwards, however, the Bishopsgate officials traced him to his new Southwark lodging—p. 274.

"Whether or no, Ratsey's biographer consciously identified the highwayman's auditor with Shakespeare, it was the prosaic course of conduct which Ratsey recommended to his actor that Shakespeare literally followed." This is a reference to the well-known allusion in *Ratsey's Ghost* (1605), an anecdotal biography of Gamaliel Ratsey, a notorious highwayman, who was hanged at Bedford, on March 26th, 1605 :—

There shalt thou learn to be frugal—for players were never so thrifty as they are now about London—and to feed upon all men ; to let none feed upon thee ; to make thy hand a stranger to thy pocket, thy heart slow to perform thy tongue's promise, and *when thou feelest thy purse well-lined, buy thee some place of lordship in the country, that growing weary of playing, thy money may there bring thee to dignity and reputation ; then thou needest care for no man, no not for them that before made thee proud with speaking their words upon the stage.*

The part I have put in italics is all that is quoted in this "Life" of Shakespeare. But from what is actually known of the prosperous player he "literally followed" the other portions of Ratsey's recommendation. And if, as appears practically certain this is an outline of the career of the Stratford man it is highly significant that he was made proud with speaking *other's* words upon the stage, and not his own.

We learn how Shakespeare obtained a coat-of-arms by false assertions, and thus John Shakespeare and his son recommended their claim "to the notice of the easy-going heralds" (p. 281-287). But these "fraudulent representations"\* were spread over a period of nearly three years, 1596-1599, and a scene in Ben Jonson's *Every Man Out of His Humour* (1599),

---

\*Let me have no lying ; it becomes none but tradesmen.

(*Winter's Tale*, IV., 3.)



has been thought to be a skit upon Shakespeare and his quest of a coat-of-arms :—" I have been so toiled among the harrots yonder," says Sogliardo. " They give a man the hardiest terms for his money." His crest is said to be a " boar without a head," and Puntarvolo suggests the motto should be, " Not without mustard."

In the course of this history of Shakespeare's quest for the " coveted distinction," it is stated that " The poet was favourably known both to Camden . . . and to the Earl of Essex." It would be interesting to know what evidence exists that there was any acquaintance between the Stratford man and either of those celebrities. I fear there is none at all. Next " the poet " figures as a " profiteer " of the worst description :—

" The harvests of 1594 and the three following years yielded badly. The prices of grain rapidly rose. The consequent distress was acute and recovery was slow." But when the poor cried, did the rich householder in Chapel Street weep? No! He " was reported to own the very substantial quantity of ten quarters or eighty bushels of corn and malt " (p. 292), and, in the midst of the general distress, Quiney appeals to Shakespeare for a loan of £30, " wherewith to discharge pressing private debts," not forgetting to mention the names of his sureties (Richard Quiney's letter makes up the total of Shakespeare's correspondence). Adrian Quiney sends a message to his son Richard, saying, " If you bargain with William Shakespeare, or receive money therefor," &c., so it may justly be inferred that the poet who said " neither a borrower nor a lender be," did not " lend money gratis."

The chapter headed " Shakespeare's Financial Resources " continues the story of his " astute business

transactions." That these should synchronise with the production of Shakespeare's noblest literary work is, we are assured, "an inconsistency that is more apparent than real." The poet "inherited his father's love of litigation, and stood rigorously by his rights in all his business relations." He must have valued these petty matters far above his literary work, for which he never troubled to stand by his right, or even enter a mild protest against infringements. We are told that "he was not averse from advancing money to impecunious neighbours," and "he was punctual and pertinacious in demands for repayment."

We need not follow the details of Shakespeare as "a frequent suitor in the local court of record," and how he "avenged himself" on the surety for one of the debtors who "left the town," and so made Shakespeare's "triumph" of obtaining judgment from a jury (*sic*) for the payment of £6, with £1 5s. costs, a "barren" one. That he should write of "Kindness nobler ever than revenge," is doubtless only an inconsistency "more apparent than real."

"The sole anecdote of Shakespeare, that is positively known to have been recorded in his lifetime," is alluded to on p. 454, but the biographer refrains from quoting the extract from Manningham's diary. One would have thought that "the sole anecdote" of the great poet, recorded by the "credible chronicler," was worth any amount of belated tradition or gossip. This is only another instance of the skilful way in which the "husks" are prepared and served by the chefs who handle them. They are made to appear "so wholly satisfying" (as the critic of *Blackwood's Magazine* found this *Life of William Shakespeare*.)

Yet another suppression. It is stated that "a preacher, doubtless of Puritan proclivities, was entertained at Shakespeare's residence, New Place, after

delivering a sermon in the spring of 1614" (p. 466). I have looked in vain for mention of the fact that in the Chamberlain's accounts of Stratford (which is the source of Sir Sidney Lee's information) we find a charge "on quart of sack and on quart of clarett wine geven to a preacher at the New Place." So Shakspeare made the town pay for the drinks!

In the chapter entitled, "The Close of Life," we are reminded how Shakespeare omitted the name of his wife from the original draft of the will, "but by an interlineation in the final draft she received his 'second best bed with the furniture.'" He barred her right to a widow's dower, which, says Sir Sidney, "is pretty conclusive proof that he had the intention of excluding her from the enjoyment of his possessions after his death."

He left unpaid her debt to her father's shepherd of forty shillings, and when the latter died in 1601, "he directed his executor to recover the sum from the poet and distribute it among the poor of Stratford" (p. 280).

In 1614 "the dramatist" acquiesced in an attempt to enclose common lands, and the townsmen showed their resentment by rioting. The other "heroes" of the controversy, acting against the townsmen, were William and Thomas Combe, nephews of John Combe the usurer, "whose personality appealed most strongly to the dramatist" (p. 470).

Finally, Sir Sidney Lee does not reject "the testimony of the vicar Ward that Shakespeare and his two guests, Jonson and Drayton, when they greeted him at Stratford for the last time, 'had a merry meeting,' 'but' (the diarist proceeds) 'Shakespeare it seems drank too hard, for he died of a feavour there contracted.' He thinks "Shakespeare may well have cherished Falstaff's faith in the virtues of sherris

sack and have scorned 'thin potions.' This gossip is too good to be lightly cast aside, for here is mention of Jonson and Drayton making merry in Shakespeare's house. But I hardly think Drayton a likely partner on this occasion. He is described by Meres (1598) as "A man of virtuous disposition, honest conversation and well-governed carriage." Fuller, who was twenty-three when Drayton died, writes of him as "a pious poet; his conscience always having the command of his fancy; very temperate in his life, slow of speech and inoffensive in company." The story is probably, therefore, a myth.

We have seen the kind of life led by the accepted author of the immortal poems and plays—the man who has been said to have "taught the world." But nothing seems to disturb the faith of the orthodox Shakespearean. He has made up his mind that these inconsistencies (if he will allow there are any) are "more apparent than real." The complacency and assurance with which that chapter, "The Close of Life," is brought to an end, is, in the face of the facts, simply amazing:—

At Stratford, in later life, he loyally conformed to the social standards which prevailed among his well-to-do neighbours, and he was proud of the regard which small landowners and prosperous traders extended to him as to one of their own social rank. Ideals so homely are reckoned rare in poets, but Chaucer and Sir Walter Scott, among writers of exalted genius, vie with Shakespeare in the sobriety of their personal aims and in the sanity of their mental attitude towards life's ordinary incidents.

It is pitiable that this should be the kind of stuff required by the world of readers. But traditions become established, and all kinds of vested interests crop up around them that it becomes essential to the maintenance of them to "educate" the masses to



the acceptance as beliefs of what prove on investigation to be the wildest impossibilities. It requires infinite patience to persuade a person to question the instruction of his youth, but, though still the much abused minority, we must not be discouraged.

No wonder *The Daily Telegraph* reviewer had to admit that, "There is so little to say about Shakespeare the man," and, of the very mean record of external events which make up this "Life," could only say that these "are not the exhibition of a human soul, not biography, not Shakespeare!" On the other hand, however, a very foolish scribe in *The Contemporary Review* asserts that the Plays "reveal just the very personality that the extant material collated here reveals," and of the Stratford man ("as Sphinx-like as ever," says *The Times*), "There is, in fact, to-day no man that we know better." It is deplorable that any self-respecting journal should print such stuff.

Sir Sidney Lee is careful to call his "memorial" *A Life*. As Mr. Walter de la Mare significantly observed in *The Westminster Gazette*, "*The life is elsewhere.*"

R. L. EAGLE.

---

P.S.--Whoever erected the Stratford Monument must have intended a jocular allusion to the fact that during the famine, Shakespere held tightly to his sacks of corn. What other interpretation is possible? No wonder when the monument was "restored" to its present form, the sack, which the figure was grasping with both hands and pressing to himself, was removed and the whole erection made into a poet's, instead of a tradesman's, memorial. Sir Sidney Lee agrees that "his *local* repute justified the distinction of a grave before the altar, and that "as part owner of the tithes and consequently one of the lay rectors, the dramatist (*sic*) had a right of interment in the chancel."

“Do you suppose that, when all the entrances and passages to the mind of all men are infested and obstructed with the darkest idols, and these seated and burned in, as it were, into their substance, that clear and smooth places can be found for receiving the true and natural rays of objects? A new process must be instituted by which to insinuate ourselves into minds so entirely obstructed. For, as the delusions of the insane are removed by art and ingenuity, so must we adapt ourselves to the universal insanity.”



## THE FIRST FOLIO OF SHAKESPEARE.

THE claim to the Shakespearean authorship rests mainly upon the appearance of Shakespeare's name on the Title Page of the First Folio of "Mr. William Shakespeare's Comedies, Histories and Tragedies." The Actor, as far as known, was never identified with any of the Plays contained in the First Folio except by hearsay, and by the appearance of the name, "William Shake-speare" or "Shakespeare," "W.Sh." or "W.S." on the title pages of certain of the Quartos, and subsequently of the name "Mr. William Shakespeare" on the Title Page of the First Folio. Several facsimiles of the First Folio have been published, the best one being that issued in 1902 by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, under the direction of Sir Sidney Lee, as it is reproduced from the copy of the First Folio in the Duke of Devonshire's Library at Chatsworth, which is an exceptionally fine one. This valuable facsimile is prefaced by an Introduction of great critical interest from the pen of Sir Sidney Lee,

who remarks on page 29 of the Introduction that :  
 " Proofs that the book was printed off without adequate supervision could be multiplied almost indefinitely and " apart from misprints in the text, errors in pagination recur with embarrassing frequency. For example, in Hamlet, page 156, is followed by page 257, and the subsequent pages run on consecutively from 257, so that 100 numbers are missed in the pagination of the Tragedies section."

On page 32 of the Introduction, Sir Sidney Lee says :  
 " Despite spasmodic efforts of the press corrector, no thorough revision of the whole volume was attempted—*most of the irregularities in pagination—remained to the last.*

Now these so-called errors in pagination being so numerous and *not being corrected* should have been sufficient to make the student of the plays pause and consider if there was any reason why the pages should bear wrong numbers.

With all deference to Sir Sidney Lee; it will, I think, strike any unbiassed person who examines this reprint that the original Folio must have been one of the most remarkable specimens of English typography of that period. It was got up in sumptuous style and regardless of expense, and whoever was financially responsible for its production would naturally desire it to be as perfect and free from errors as was possible. How then are we to account for these misprints and mispaginations, which are too numerous and glaring to escape the notice of the veriest printer's apprentice ? How are we to explain the fact that, as Sir Sidney Lee remarks, most of the errors remained to the last; despite spasmodic efforts at revision ? Does not the anomaly between the costliness of the volume and the slovenly editorship suggest the possibility that this seemingly culpable carelessness was actually deliberate and inten-

tional? And does not this possibility provoke an enquiry as to the probable intention?

What makes one almost certain that the false paging is *intentional* and *not accidental*, is proved in the following way—for example, instead of page 77 following page 76 in the Tragedies, the next page is not 77 but 79, and the following pages are numbered 80, 81, 82, 81, 82. The second of the two pages numbered 82 is correctly numbered, which shows that the printer was quite aware that the intermediate pages are incorrectly numbered. However, the printer does not alter or correct the paging, although he shows that he knows the real and right numbering *by taking it up again correctly* when he likes.

When two pages bear the same number, the probability is that there is some connection between them which has to be discovered. But is such mispaging peculiar to this Folio, or is it to be found in other books of the period? The answer to the second question is in the affirmative, and one glaring instance is the first edition of "The Two Books of Francis Bacon—of the Proficiency and Advancement in Learning, Divine and Humane," published by Henry Tomes (1605). Each leaf instead of each page in this book is numbered, and one finds that in the second book the leaves from 31 to 70 are correctly numbered and then the leaves are numbered as follows: 70, 70, 71, 70, 72, 74, 73, 74, 75, 69, 77, 78, 79, 80, 77, 74, 74, 69, 69, 82, 87, 79, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 97, 99, 94, 100, 99, 102, 103, 103, 93, 106, and so on. Here we find a book written by Sir Francis Bacon in which the numbers on certain of the leaves are duplicated, and the leaves wrongly numbered in apparently the most random fashion. Thus the phenomenon we observe in the First Folio is anticipated in "The Proficiency and Advancement of Learning," and the question inevitable suggests itself whether there is not a similar reason for both.



The First Folio includes three divisions, namely, Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, and each division starts with a fresh pagination, commencing with page 1. The pages are divided into two columns ; and a full column contains 66 lines, the majority of which are dialogue lines, interspersed here and there with stage directions. For the purpose of making the calculations given later; the dialogue lines alone are counted, and this count is made either upwards from the bottom or downwards from the top of the column. The pages of the Folio and not the columns are numbered, so that in counting the columns the right hand one will be twice the page number and the left hand one will be one less than twice the page number. As it has been remarked already, the page numbering shows some curious vagaries, certain pages being duplicated. In the Histories, for instance, the pages run from numbers 1 to 100, and then start again with 69 and run on to 232.

The first step taken in this investigation was to re-number the pages of the facsimile correctly, keeping the three divisions of the Plays, namely, Comedies, Histories and Tragedies, distinct. The pages in the Comedies did not require re-numbering as a whole, as they run consecutively (with certain mispaginations) from 1 to 303. In the Histories the pages are numbered 1 to 46, then two page numbers are dropped, the next page being numbered 49 instead of 47. The numbers then run consecutively from 47 to 100, then comes an unnumbered page containing an Epilogue, followed by an unnumbered page containing Actors' names, the next page is numbered 69, and the numbers then run consecutively from 69 to 232. The page following that which is numbered 100 was re-numbered 101, and so on consecutively to the end of the Histories, so that the last page of this division is correctly numbered p. 264 instead of 232, its number in the

Folio. The Play *Troilus and Cressida* was apparently inserted as an after-thought, as only two pages are numbered, namely, the second and third pages which are numbered 79 and 80. The first page of *Troilus and Cressida* was accordingly numbered 78, the page following the page numbered 80 was numbered 81, and so on to the end, which makes the last page of this Play number 105.

In the Tragedies the pages run from 1 consecutively (with certain exceptions) to 98, then comes an unnumbered page containing Actors' names, then a page left blank. The next page is numbered 109 and the page numbers then run consecutively from 109 to 156. The next page to 156 is numbered 257, and the page numbers then run consecutively (with certain intermediate mis-paginations) to 398 and then comes the last page numbered 993. In the Tragedies the page following that numbered 98 was renumbered 99, and so on to the end, thus making the last page of the Tragedies 291 instead of 993.

As I was reading in the Comedies in the Play, "The Merry Wives of Windsor," I came across this curious line :—

AND MAKE MILCH-KINE YEELD BLOOD AND  
SHAKES A CHAINE.

The word "Shakes" arrested my attention by its ungrammatical construction, and it suggested the question whether there might not be some reason for it. I noticed that the number of the page was 56, that it was in the left hand column, which therefore counted as the 111th, and that it was on the 25th line down that column. Was there any significance in these figures? On turning to the Histories, I found that the page in the Histories which is numbered 56 was wrongly numbered and should have been numbered 54. But there appeared to be a reason for such wrong num-

bering, for on the left hand column, the 25th line down ends with a mysterious long ———. Now this page is occupied by part of the Play, entitled "The First Part of King Henry the Fourth," and the first page of this Play is correctly numbered 46, but the next page, which should of course be numbered 47, is incorrectly numbered 49, and the incorrect numbering is maintained so that the page which should be numbered 56 is wrongly numbered 58. In the first column of this page which is wrongly numbered 58 (the correct number being 56) on the 25th line down, is the sentence :—

"BARD. YEA AND TO TICKLE OUR NOSES WITH SPEAR-GRASSE."

Let us re-state these remarkable coincidences :—

On the true page 56 and column III of the *Comedies* on the 25th line counting *down* the column, is the word *SHAKES*.

On the false page 56 and column III of the *Histories*, on the 25th line counting *down* the column, is a long ———.

On the true page 56 (wrongly numbered 58) and column III of the *Histories* on the 25th line counting *down* the column, is the word *SPEAR*.

This combination thus yields Shakes-spear.

It may be remarked incidentally that the word SHAKE also appears on the 24th line counting down column III of the Tragedies, but this must be reserved for future reference.

This coincidence naturally piqued my curiosity, and led to further investigation to discover whether after all it might not be purely accidental. But closer analysis yields some more interesting results.

Placing our two lines together for convenience of reference and calling them A and B.

A. AND MAKE MILCH-KINE YEELD BLOOD  
AND SHAKES A CHAINE.

B. BARD. YEA AND TO TICKLE OUR NOSES  
WITH SPEAR-GRASSE.

Let us count the letters in each line, including the two hyphens as letters, and we find :—

Line A. 30 letters, then the word Shakes, then 7 letters.

Line B. 30 letters, then the word Spear, then 7 letters.

Does this suggest no design? Can it be a mere accident that the 31st letter on the 25th line down column III of the Comedies is the 1st letter of the word Shakes and that the 31st letter on the 25th line down column III of the Histories is the 1st letter of the word Spear?

It seemed to me that there was here at least *prima facie* evidence that the Editor of the Folio *intentionally* introduced Shakes and Spear and their connecting hyphen in their respective places, and that the connection was cryptically indicated in the way and by the methods I have described.

But what was the purpose of all this? Why should the Editor be at the trouble to insert the author's name in so curious a manner in the body of his Plays seven years after Shakespeare's death? This is a point which calls for further investigation.

On looking carefully at the first column of the false page 56 of the Histories in which on the 25th line *down* is the long dash ———, I find that there is another dash ——— in this column, and curiously enough this second dash is at the end of the 25th line counting *up* the column. It will also be observed that the only word on the line below the first ——— is the word Francis, and the only word on the line below the second ——— is also the word Francis. Now this column is the first column on the false page 56 and therefore the *true page* 54 of the Histories. On looking at the false



page 54 of the Histories (that is the one wrongly numbered 54) in the 2nd column is to be found the word "Bacon." Whereabouts in the column is this word placed? It is on the 25th line counting up the column and also the 25th line counting down the column, and a glance at this page will clearly show that the type is purposely set to make the line on which the word "Bacon" appears the 25th line, counting up or down the column, and the word itself is exactly in the middle of the line, there being 20 letters in front of it and 20 letters (counting the hyphen as a letter as before) after it. Does not this show design?

Let us recapitulate.

*Comedies*, page 56, 1st column, 25th line down, is "Shakes."

*Histories*, false page 56, correct page 54, 1st column, 25th line up or down, is —— (the only word on the line below *Francis*.)

*Histories*, correct page 52, false page 54, 2nd column, 25th line up or down, is *Bacon*.

*Histories*, correct page 56, false page 58, 1st column, 25th line down, is "Spear."

A reason for the dropping of two numbers in numbering the pages of the Histories is at once apparent. The author wishes to connect the three pages in the Histories above mentioned. It is too obvious to place the same number on each of the three pages, but the same effect is produced by dropping two numbers earlier in the Play, thus making the page numbered 58 *the true page 56*, which connects it with the page *falsely numbered 56*, and it follows that the page numbered 56 is *the true page 54*, and this connects this page with the page *falsely numbered 54* and so on backwards or forwards in this first division of the Histories. A more ingenious method of connecting pages can hardly be imagined.

That the pages bearing the same number either true or false are connected is proved as follows :—

Comedies, page No. 56, on 25th line down, is Shakes.

Histories, page No. 56, on 25th line down, is ———

This page of the Histories is really page 54.

Histories, true page 54, on 25th line down, is ———.

Tragedies, page No. 54, on 25th line down, is Peer.

Thus again I find Shakes—Peer, and that this is no coincidence is proved because the line containing Shakes has 30 letters before this word, and the line containing Peer has also 30 letters after this word.

Let us go back to the word "Shakes" on page 56 of the Comedies. Who is it who "shakes a chain," and why a chain? A chain consists of links, and we have already been able to link together Shakes-Spear and Bacon. The gentleman who shakes a chain is "Herne the Hunter." This character appears again on page 59 of the Comedies, and attention is drawn to this page because, although it is the true page 59, it is paged 51. On this page 59, the 25th line down contains this sentence, "WILL NONE BUT *HERNE* THE HUNTER SERVE YOUR TURNE," the W of Will being formed of two V's in a most conspicuous manner.

It will be remembered that on the 25th line down the 1st column of page 56 of the Comedies, there are 30 letters, then the word Shakes, and counting back from the last letter of the above sentence there are 30 Roman letters, then the word Will. This word "Will" is on the 25th line down the 2nd column of true page 59 of the Comedies, and the word Shakes is on 25th line down the 1st column of page 56 of the Comedies, a difference of 8 columns.

The 25th line down the 2nd column of the page No. 59 in the Histories contains this sentence :—  
NOW MY MASTERS FOR A TRUE FACE AND  
GOOD CONSCIENCE.

Counting 30 letters back from the last letter of this line cuts off the S of the word MASTERS, leaving MASTER, so one gets this result :—

Histories, page No. 59 (true page 57), 2nd column, 25th line down, is the word Master + 30 letters.

Comedies, true page 59, 2nd column, 25th line down, is the word Will + 30 letters.

Eight columns back.

Comedies, page 56, 1st column, 25th line down, are 30 letters, then Shakes.

Comedies, true page 56, 1st column, 25th line down, is the long ———.

Histories, true page 56, 1st column, 25th line down, are 30 letters then Spear.

Eight columns back.

Histories, page No. 54, 2nd column, 25th line is the word "BACON."

I also find this strange coincidence :—

Histories, true page 57, 2nd column, 25th line down, is the word Master.

Tragedies, page 57, 2nd column, 25th line down, the first word is Will.

Eight columns back.

Tragedies, page 54, 1st column, 25th line down, the first word is Peer.

Histories, true page 54 (page Nod. 56), 1st column, 25th line down, is the long ———.

Comedies, page 56, 1st column, 25th line down, is the word Shakes.

Anyone who will take the trouble to study the First Folio of the Shakespeare Plays will accordingly find that Master Will Shakespeare was but a mask of Sir Francis Bacon.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

THE BACON ACROSTICS IN THE LITERATURE OF  
THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES AS DISCOVERED  
PREVIOUS TO 1902, BY ALFRED MUDIE, OF  
LONDON.

---

### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In 1909 that fine, and extensively illustrated book, by William S. Booth, of Boston, Mass., U.S.A., entitled "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon," was described in *BACONIANA*, of July, 1909, page 209. This work goes into the subject of acrostics very extensively, but a simpler anagram is described in Rev. Walter Begley's "Is it Shakespeare?" page 354. The anagram is more fully described and illustrated by the discoverer, Mr. Alfred Mudie, of London, in his pamphlet, "The Shakespeare Anagrams," 1902.

The anagram, or acrostic of Francis Bacon is found in the poems of Spenser, the plays of Marlowe, the poems and plays of Shakespeare, in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* [which play Jonson himself states was written by another pen], and many other poems and plays attributed to various writers of the 16th and 17th centuries. The first verse of the "Passionate Pilgrim" contains the name of "Francis Bacon" beginning with the first letter "f" and ending with "n" in the last line. When this verse was re-written and changed, as it appears in Sonnet 138, instead of Francis Bacon, "Francis of Verulam" is found, ending on the last "m." As Sir Francis Bacon did not receive the title of "Verulam" until 1619, it is sufficient proof that the sonnets were not printed until after 1619, that the date of 1603 is a false date, as asserted by Dr. J. E. Roe, of South Lima, New York State, U.S.A., in the columns of *BACONIANA*. This fact coincides with the false dates of the quartos of 1600 and 1609, which were not printed until 1619.

Another instance where a similar change is to be found is in the Quarto edition of the 1608 (?) [true date is 1619] edition of *King Lear*, and in the Folio of 1623; in the 1619 edition, "Francis Bacon" is found in the last nine lines, but in the Folio Viscount Saint Alban, added this line, *Exeunt with a Dead March*, so that the letter "M" could be found for the word "Verulam." These italic letters also form a part of Bacon's bi-literal cipher that is inserted in this "Tragedie of King Lear."



EXTRACT FROM THE 1608 (?) QUARTO EDITION OF  
KING LEAR—THE LAST NINE LINES (*Act V.,  
Sc. III.*)

- 2978.—*Duke* : Beare them *from* hence, our present      *Fr*  
                  busines  
                  Is to generall woe, friends of my soule, you      *a n*  
                  twaine  
                  Rule in this kingdome, and the goàrd state sustaine.
2981.    *Kent* : I haue a journey, sir, shortly to go,  
                  My maister *calls*, and *I* must not say noa,      *c i s*
2983.    *Duke* : The waight of this sad time we must      *B*  
                  obey  
                  Speake what we feele, not what we ought to      *a*  
                  say.
2985.    The oldest haue borne most, we that are yong,  
2986.    Shall neuer see so much, nor liue so long.      *c o n*

THE SAME LINES AS CHANGED IN THE 1623 FOLIO,  
PART 3, PAGE 309.

*Alb.* : Beare them *from* hence, our present businesse      *Fr*  
Is generall woe : Friends of my soule, you twaine,      *a n*  
Rule in this Realme, and the gor'd state sustaine.

*Kent* : I haue a journey, Sir, shortly to go,  
My Master *calls* me, *I* must not say no.      *c i s*

*Edg.* : The waight *of* this sad time we must obey,      *o f*  
Speake what we feele, not what we ought to say :  
The oldest hath borne most, we that are yong,  
Shall *neuer* see so much, nor *liue* so long.      *V e r u l*

*Exeunt with a dead March,*      *I a m*

R. A. Smith.

Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

NOTE.—Mr. Smith in his letter makes a very interesting statement in regard to the acrostic signatures in "I. Passionate Pilgrim," and Sonnet CXXXVIII. We have thought it well to reproduce these stanzas, so that our members may see how curiously complete the signatures are :—

## I. PASSIONATE PILGRIM.

When my love swears that she is made of truth,	Fr
I do believe her, though I know she lies,	
That she might think me some untutor'd youth,	an
Unskilful in the world's false forgeries.	
Thus vainly thinking that she thinks me young,	
Although I know my year be past the best	
I smiling credit her false-speaking tongue	cis
Outfacing faults in love with love's ill rest.	
But wherefore says my love that she is young ?	Ba
And wherefore say not I that I am old ?	
O, love's best habit is a soothing tongue,	
And age, in love, love's not to have years told.	
Therefore I'll lie with love, and love with me	
Since that our faults in love thus smother'd be.	con

## SONNET CXXXVIII.

When my love swears that she is made of truth,	Fr
I do believe her, though I know she lies,	
That she might think me some untutor'd youth	
Unlearned in the world's false subtleties.	an
Thus vainly thinking that she thinks me young	
Although she knows my days are past the best,	
Simply I credit her false-speaking tongue :	cis
On both sides thus is simple truth suppress'd.	o
But wherefore says she not she is unjust ?	f
And wherefore say not I that I am old ?	
O, love's best habit is in seeming trust,	Veru
And age in love loves not to have years told :	la
Therefore I lie with her and she with me,	m
And in our faults by lies we flatter'd be.	

The method of working out these acrostic signatures is to take the first " F," then the next " r," the next " a," the next " n," and so on to the end, and to be complete, and certain, the name, or the sentence, should use up all the verse ; the final letter of the name should at least be the last use of that letter in the verse. It may seem at first sight an easy thing to do this or that many different names might be spelt out ; but this is not the case, when the condition of using up the verse is observed. " Francis of Verulam " can be spelt out of the Passionate Pilgrim verse, but in that case Verulam ends on the " m " in " am " on the tenth line, leaving four lines unused ; which would show that that was not the message there intended. Much change had to be made in the Sonnet

to ensure that "of Verulam" would come right to the end in place of "Bacon," and these changes are very interesting. One can hardly think that this has come about by accident, and not by design. "Francis Bacon" cannot be spelt out of Sonnet CXXXVIII., following the rules given.—ED., BACONIANA.

---

#### DID BACON DIE IN 1626 ?

---

SIR,—The letter of Mr. Granville Cunningham in the January number of BACONIANA, in which he complains that my criticism was unfair and that I misquoted his article, is so unconvincing, that I should like to protest against the fallacy underlying his argument; and at the same time to invite your readers to examine what I may call the personal complaint, and to see whether it has any justification.

It will be convenient, perhaps, to recall the undisputed facts, which may be shortly stated as follows :—

There is a letter among the Gibson MSS. in the Lambeth Palace Library subscribed with the letters "T.M." and apparently written by Thomas Meautys. The letter is not addressed to anyone, and is only dated "October 11th," no year being given. It has been entered in the catalogue as a letter from Meautys to Bacon, and was accepted as such by Montague in his "Life of Bacon."

Mr. Cunningham has now discovered that "the contents of the letter show without a doubt that it was written in the year 1631."

On this discovery, Mr. Cunningham says he believes that Bacon did not die in 1626, and contends that this letter proves it.

On the other hand, I ventured to suggest that it was easier to believe the letter had been erroneously described as a letter written to Bacon, than that Bacon was living in 1631, five years after the recorded date of his death. There is certainly nothing in Mr. Cunningham's letter to suggest any reasonable doubt about it.

But now I come to the personal complaint. Mr. Cunningham alleges that I "seem to wish to burke, if I can, any investigation into the fact of the existence of this letter, and to whom it was written."

As to the existence of the letter, I never questioned the fact.

The letter is in Lambeth Palace Library, where I have spent many hours from time to time examining and copying the Bacon MSS. Nor have I any wish to burke investigation.

The object of research work is to ascertain the truth, and Mr. Cunningham may be congratulated on his discovery of the error made by Montague in assuming that the letter was written to Bacon. Such slips are often made—*humanum est errare*—and may be undetected for a very long period, particularly with regard to documents of no great interest or importance; and although it is only a matter of opinion and I may be wrong, I should like to say that Mr. Cunningham's description of the letter as "a most remarkable document" seems rather an exaggeration; as in many another letter, the best part is, I think, in the postscript. I like that human touch about the wayward maid, Mary, and the picture of the writer scribbling in the light of a spluttering dip.

Another statement that surprises me is where Mr. Cunningham says:—"The curious thing about the letter is the air of concealment that envelopes it; the entire absence of anything that on the face of it would show for whom it was meant."

But I must pass on to the more serious part of the complaint, because Mr. Cunningham alleges that I have misquoted him, and that my criticism is unfair. It may be that Mr. Cunningham did not realise the effect of what he wrote, but I certainly did not misquote him. After referring to the astounding inferences drawn from the erroneous proposition that Bacon was alive in 1631, I stated—"In Mr. Cunningham's opinion, Bacon made a bogus will and Lady St. Alban committed bigamy."

As to the bogus will, the following is a quotation from Mr. Cunningham's article:—

"Believing as I do, and as the letter we have been considering shows, that Bacon lived after 1626, and that his disappearance then from the world's stage was only a retirement into hiding, it is quite certain that his will, though it was implemented as though he died, must have been drawn and planned largely as a 'blind' and to enable him to use his property after his death."

With regard to the bigamous marriage, Mr. Cunningham says:—

"My opinion is, not that Lady Bacon committed bigamy, as Mr. Hardy says, but that in order to blind and mislead the public and establish the conviction in the public mind that Bacon died in 1626, the story was deliberately put about that Lady Bacon had married her gentleman usher."

But that is not all, for Mr. Cunningham adds:—

"Therefore a fictitious marriage with her gentleman usher was enacted."



Now I am bound to ask Mr. Cunningham how is a fictitious marriage "enacted," unless the parties go through the ceremony of marriage? And if Lady Bacon went through the ceremony of marriage with her gentleman usher, knowing that her husband was alive at the time—such is the crude suggestion—she would be guilty of a criminal offence and the marriage would be properly described as "bigamous."

I agree with Mr. Cunningham that we are all interested in solving any mysteries that surround the life of Francis Bacon; but there are still members of the Society who are not convinced that, as to his birth or death, there is any mystery at all, and there is, I hope, room for those who, when they find assertions in *BACONIANA* which arouse their distrust, may be allowed to protest against what appears to be an imposition on their credulity.

Yours faithfully,

HAROLD HARDY.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

Stratheden Mansions Hotel,

59-63, Regency Square,

Brighton.

August 19th, 1917.

DEAR SIR,—The lands and estates held by Francis Bacon are many, and varied, and it seems that all his life-long, he was acquiring property only to sell it again, often at a loss, when his creditors pressed him for payment.

Up to the present, I was not aware that he held land in Bedfordshire, and will be glad of further light on the subject.

It appears that the ancient Manor of Old Warden in Bedfordshire, which in the time of the Domesday Survey was held by Wicken Speck, as a Manor of 9 Hides, was granted to Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII. in 1550, for life. She probably drew the revenues of it, and later on this Crown property descended to James I.'s eldest son, Prince Henry. But that Prince only held it for two years before his death, after which it was bestowed upon his brother Charles in 1616. No sooner did the estate pass into the possession of Charles, Prince of Wales, than he granted a lease of it for 99 years to *Sir Francis Bacon*. This was held by Sir Francis until his death in 1626, and, in 1628, the reversion was granted to Edward Ditchfield and others for the Corporation of London.

It seems remarkable that Prince Charles should part with valuable land which had just been bestowed upon him, and

we wonder if it was given for services rendered and what the occasion was. But this was not the only land in Bedfordshire owned by Sir Francis, for, in 1617, he obtained a lease for 99 years of the ancient Manor House of Flitwick (sometimes written Flietewicke, or Flythwick). There are other names joined to his in this latter lease, and they eventually transferred their interest in the property to William Williams and others in 1628, which was after Bacon's death. There is a further point of interest to be mentioned as regards the old Cistercian Abbey of Warden, which was founded in 1135; for its orchard was celebrated for a particularly sweet pear, and this fruit is mentioned in Shakespeare's "*Winter's Tale*," where the clown is made to say :

" I must have saffron to colour the *Warden Pie*."

So that particular pie was made in Bedfordshire most probably.

The counter seal of the Abbey was a shield bearing a crozier between three pears.

This touch from "*Winter's Tale*" seems to bring Bacon very near us, when we find he owned Old Warden Manor at one time.

A list of the places acquired by Bacon would include :—

Marks,

Cheltenham,

Charlton Kings,

Pitts.

Twickenham Park and adjoining lands.

Gorhambury Estate.

Old Warden and Flitwick, Bedfordshire.

Zelwood Forest.

Can the list be further added to ?

Yours truly,

ALICE CHAMBERS BUNTEN.

#### QUERIES.

##### EDITOR OF "*BACONIANA*."

SIR,—I have so far pieced together the various scattered facts as to have enabled me to write a new Life of Bacon. No publisher is likely to undertake the risk of publication at the present time, so that I shall amuse myself with augmenting the biography as new facts come along.

Could anyone lend me :—

Ritter's History of Ancient Philosophy. English Trans., 1838.

Barnabe Rich's Farewell to the Military Profession, 1581.  
ditto "Don Simonides," 1581 and 1584.

"History of the Reign of Charles I." 1656.

Any account of the visit of Muley Hamel Xarife and suite to England in August, 1600.

I have Nichols Progresses where the visit is mentioned. Possibly Bacon was attracted by the name "Hamet," which is the name of the Arabian said to have written "Don Quixote."

Any accounts by Royal Society men about 1662-1700 or later, which make statements about the manner of Bacon's death would also be useful. Books by Dr. Sprat and Dr. Wallis would be worth referring to. Bushel's works and life should contain interesting revelations about the period. So would Elias Ashmole's.

PARKER WOODWARD.

### "BACON AND SHAKESPEARE."

#### TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Mr. Crouch Batchelor's "reflections" upon Bacon and Shakespeare (BACONIANA, April, 1917), is an admirable summary, and contains so much that is absolutely unanswerable by the supporters of the Stratford fellow, that any honest person in their ranks would be induced, on reading it, to take up the study of this enthralling subject. But it invariably happens, where there is a large display of facts, points are made of evidence that is not of the strongest class. This is very difficult to avoid, but any well-informed Stratfordian, desirous of debating the question (though not many of them are), would confine himself to the very few weak arguments, and ignore the most important points. It would be an excellent scheme if this "paper" were to be reproduced in pamphlet form, and circulated in the Stratford camp, but it seems first of all desirable to call attention to a few vulnerable spots in Mr. Batchelor's front line:

1. Page 78.—"In his lifetime he (Ben Jonson) satirised the actor most savagely in a play called *The Poetaster*, and several of the disgraceful incidents I have alluded to are unmistakably introduced."

The only character in *The Poetaster*, who can possibly represent the Stratford player, is Luscus. There is a reference to his minding horses, but I cannot find any allusions to the "disgraceful incidents" of his career. It is true that Jonson attacks actors generally, and the loathsome and degraded condition of the stage, and the audiences.

2. It cannot be proved that Jonson edited the First Folio.



Under the circumstances mentioned by Mr. Batchelor (p. 79), most probably he did. But assumptions can be left to the Stratfordians—they specialise in them.

3. Page 80.—The words "he could with difficulty be induced to pass by a jest," do not exactly quote Ben Jonson. This should be corrected to read :

"His language (where he could spare or pass by a jest) was nobly censorious."

4. Page 84.—Although the Sonnets reveal the aristocratic mind of the poet, it is not quite accurate to say that "the involuntary repugnance of the author to the common people" is especially prominent in the Sonnets. It seems to me to be remarkably subdued, when we remember *Coriolanus* and *Julius Caesar*.

5. Page 85.—The statement that "The Plays were written for the library, not the stage," is rather a dangerous one. *The Comedy o' Errors* and *Twelfth Night* are known to have been performed at Gray's Inn, and the Middle Temple respectively. For the audience there, these comedies were no doubt especially written, and they are good acting plays. In the case of certain other plays (*Hamlet*, for instance) subsequent revision and alteration impaired their fitness for the stage, but enhanced their value for the library. Others again (like *Antony and Cleopatra*) never were stage-plays.

6. Page 97.—It was not of the Shakespeare play that "Elizabeth insisted upon Bacon discovering the author," but what Bacon calls, "The Book of Deposing King Richard the Second, and the coming in of Henry the 4th, supposed to be written by Doctor Hayward, who was committed to the Tower for it." It is not at all certain that "Shakespeare's" *Richard II.* was the play which Sir Charles Percy and other supporters of Essex ordered to be performed by the Lord Chamberlain's men. Professor Dowden says, "That this was Shakespeare's play is very unlikely." In the Preface to *Richard II.* (Clarendon Press Series) the Editors, Clark and Wright, say : "It is certain that this was not Shakespeare's play. At least two other plays on the same subject were extant." They point out that Shakespeare's would not serve the ends of the conspirators even with the deposition scene, because the sympathies of the audience are powerfully attracted to the deposed King. Moreover the Essex conspirators were most anxious to disclaim any attempt upon the life of the Queen.

In his *Apologia*, Bacon certainly hints that he was the author of more than one history of *Richard II.* ("my own tales"), but



the evidence is purposely made obscure by Bacon, and is not of the best kind for Baconians to make use of.

On the same page it is stated that Francis and his brother lived for a time near the actors in Bishopsgate, and that Lady Anne Bacon bitterly reproached them for doing so. I have never heard that Francis ever lived in Bishopsgate, or that his mother reproached him for doing so. Is Mr. Batchelor thinking of her letter imploring the brothers not to mask, no: mum, nor sinfully revel at Gray's Inn?

The many hard blows from Mr. Batchelor's sledge-hammer should be sufficient to make the most obstinate and thick-skinned Stratfordian confess, and repent. But they decline to play the game, knowing that they will be "bunkered" at every turn. I have sent a copy of *BACONIANA*, containing this summary of facts, to a prominent Shakespearean in the North of England, in the remote expectation of drawing a reply from him. If it be forthcoming, Mr. Batchelor will have the time of his life.

I am, Sir,

Yours truly,

R. L. EAGLE.

19, Burghill Road,  
Sydenham, S.E.,

July 23rd, 1917.

---

*TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."*

DEAR SIR,—The following letter from the late Lady Elizabeth Cust bears out my view of the identity of the Duke in "Twelfth Night." I send it to you for insertion, if you see fit, in *BACONIANA* :—

"DEAR MISS LEITH,—Thank you for allowing me to see your articles on "Twelfth Night." I have been looking at some authorities, and find that the Duke that you wished to refer to was Ludovick Stuart, second Duke of Lenox, created Duke of Richmond, 17th May, 1623. His father, Esme Stuart, Lord d'Aubigny, first Duke of Lenox, died 26th May, 1583, therefore it must have been Duke Ludovic, who, in 1592, according to Mrs. Murray Smith (Bradley), Vol. I., p. 81. and Miss Cooper, Vol. I., p. 118, 'longeth after Arabella.' How both Miss Cooper and Mrs. M. Smith both chose to call him D'Aubigny and to identify him with his father, who died 1583, I cannot imagine.

"Now a grain of comfort for you. James I., who probably at one time intended to make his young cousin and *protégé*

Ludovic, second Duke, his heir, had sent for the boy directly after his father's death. The Master of Grey brought him to Scotland, in November, 1583, when he was nine years old, he being born September 29th, 1574. At an early age James appointed him to various offices in Scotland, and in July, 1601, sent him as Ambassador to France, where Duke Ludovic took the opportunity of visiting (his mother) Katherine, Duchess of Lenox, and he brought his brother, Esme Stuart, back with him. November, 1601, he was appointed Ambassador to England (*Doyle's Official Baronage*, Vol. III.), and both brothers were probably present on February 2nd, 1602, and Ludovic had the opportunity of falling in love with Arabella if she was in London. Although older than her other lover, Seymour, he was quite a young man. . . . I know Duke Ludovic was already married, but was perhaps then a widower. I am interested in reading your articles and will return them soon. You must make the best of the information I have sent, as I am too busy to look the matter up any more. I recommend you to study the two Peerages I have quoted and the State Paper Calendars.—Yours truly,

“ELIZABETH C. CUST.”

This additional note was sent me, too, by Lady Elizabeth Cust :—“ Sir Robert Gordon, contemporary of Ludovic, in his ‘History of the Sutherland Family,’ states that when King James went to Denmark, in 1589, that he appointed Ludovic, Duke of Lenox, Viceroy of Scotland during his absence, and named him heir to the crown of Scotland in case he died on the voyage, as being the next lawful heir to the crown (through his descent from Princess Mary, daughter of James II.). I notice that D’Israeli, in ‘Curiosities of Literature,’ made the same confusion of Esme and Ludovic as Miss Cooper and Mrs. Murray Smith have done.”

I have discovered how this came about. (Note that I am speaking now.—A. A. LEITH). Camden writes of Esme Stuart, Count d’Aubigny, “ James conferred on him title of Duke of Lennox. His son, Ludovic (Lewis) Esme enjoys it at this day,” which discovery of mine puts the matter at rest. One thing more. Arabella alludes constantly in her mysterious letters to “ The King of Scots,” “ that noble gentleman,” whom she desireth her Majesty to grace and to win his heart from her, whom she “ dare not see nor send but by stealth,” “ by whose love she is so much honoured.” He, as I think, was Ludovic.—Yours truly,

November, 1917.

A. A. LEITH.